

Serial No. 10/549,466
Response dated 10/21/2008
Reply to Office Action dated 6/26/08

PATENT
PU030082
Customer No. 24498

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-22 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-22 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1, 8, 12, and 18 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite due to the use of the verb “implementing”. The rejection indicates that it is unclear what is being implemented.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 are amended to use the term “configuring the access point with the new administration information” instead of “implementing the new administration information”. Support for this amendment is found in paragraphs 0002 and 0007 of US Patent Publication No. 2006/0173981 representing the as-filed specification. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection as a result of the amendment to independent Claims 1 and 8.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-15, and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “WRT51AB Dual-Band Wireless A+B Broadband Router User Guide” (WRT51AB), in view of “Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP), and in further view of “Request for Comments 1994: PPP Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol (CHAP). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Pending Claim 1 is amended to recite “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step only if the third parameter and the second parameter match.” Applicant notes that the present invention

Serial No. 10/549,466
Response dated 10/21/2008
Reply to Office Action dated 6/26/08

PATENT
PU030082
Customer No. 24498

relates to a method for providing configuration changes in a network access point. (See paragraph 0002 of US Patent Publication 2006/0173981). The method includes a comparison at the access point of a second parameter to a third parameter. The second parameter is generated by the client terminal and sent to the access point. The third parameter is generated by the access point. The request for entry of the new configuration information is granted only if the second and third parameters match. Otherwise, if there is no match of the second and third parameters, then the request for entry of the new configuration information for the access point is denied (See Figure 3b and paragraph 0023 of US Patent Publication 2006/0173981). Thus, the present invention presents a secure method to configure an access point.

WRT51AB describes a Linksys Dual Band Wireless Broadband Router. Steps for configuring the router are presented in brief on pages 25-26 of WRT51AB (See Chapter 6 under the heading of “How to Access the Web-based Utility”). The instructions include entering the routers IP address (see page 25), changing a configuration setting, and clicking the Apply button (see page 26, top). WRT51AB allows many such configuration changes simply by changing the setting and clicking the Apply button. Examples of the “change and apply” method of WRT51AB include configuration change instructions found on WRT51AB pages 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, and 37. Applicant notes that WRT51AB allows a router configuration change without the comparison recited in pending Claim 1.

Whereas pending Claim 1 recites “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step only if the third parameter and the second parameter match”, WRT51AB teaches that a configuration change can be made by simply clicking the apply button. Thus, WRT51AB fails to teach the Claim 1 element of “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step *only if* the third parameter and the second parameter match” because the router of WRT51AB is configurable without the comparison recited in amended Claim 1.

Serial No. 10/549,466
Response dated 10/21/2008
Reply to Office Action dated 6/26/08

PATENT
PU030082
Customer No. 24498

EAP is an Extensible Authentication Protocol. WRT51AB discusses the applicability of EAP with the Router in Appendix C: “Configuring Wireless Security” on page 89. The Router of WRT51AB can use WEP or IEEE 802.1x, which is based on EAP. According to the description on page 89 of WRT51AB, EAP/802.1x may be used with the Router in combination with an authentication server, typically a RADIUS authentication server. As stated on page 89 of WRT51AB:

“For example, a wireless user may use one of the authentication methods to access a wireless network protected by an authentication server. The user’s PC sends a request to the Router (an access point can be used instead). The Router sends an identification request back to the PC. After the PC sends the Router the identification message, the Router forwards the identification message to the server. If the server accepts the identification message, then the PC is permitted access to the wireless network.” (See WRT51AB, page 89).

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-mentioned authentication method assumes that the Router is already configured. Page 91 of WRT51AB confirms this by stating:

“To use 802.1x authentication, you have to enable the 802.1x feature on the Router as well as your wireless-equipped PCs. For instructions on how to configure the Router’s 802.1x settings, go to the “Advanced Wireless” section of Chapter 6: The Router’s Web-Based Utility.” (see WRT51AB, page 91).

Thus, configuration of the Router in WRT51AB is required before use of EAP/802.1x. Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method that includes a comparison, within the access point, *before allowing a configuration of the access point*. This is in distinction to WRT51AB that indicates that the Router must be *configured before using the EAP/802.1x*. Also, whereas WRT51AB requires the use of an authentication server coincident with EAP/802.1x authentication, pending Claim 1 has no such authentication server element.

Serial No. 10/549,466
Response dated 10/21/2008
Reply to Office Action dated 6/26/08

PATENT
PU030082
Customer No. 24498

Applicant therefore concludes that the combination of WRT51AB and EAP fail to teach or suggest the Claim 1 element of “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step *only if* the third parameter and the second parameter match” because the Router of WRT51AB requires configuration *before* the use of EAP/802.1x. Applicant concludes that the combination of WRT51AB and EAP is inoperable before the Router of WRT51AB is configured.

CHAP is a Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol. Applicant respectfully submits that it is not evident that CHAP is used in conjunction with configuring an access point. Applicant can find no reference within CHAP that discusses the Claim 1 element of “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step only if the third parameter and the second parameter match”.

Accordingly, the combination of WRT51AB, EAP, and CHAP fails to describe all elements of amended independent Claim 1 because the combination fails to teach or suggest the element of “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step only if the third parameter and the second parameters match.” Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of WRT51AB, EAP, and CHAP fails to render obvious amended independent Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2-7 under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03.

Independent Claims 8, 12, and 18 are likewise amended and, as a result, also include aspects not taught or suggested by the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of references fails to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness of pending Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-15, and 18-22 under 35 USC §103(a).

Applicant notes that page 13 of the present Office Action dated 6/26/08 suggests that Claim 6 includes nonfunctional descriptive material that is not functionally involved in the recited steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Serial No. 10/549,466
Response dated 10/21/2008
Reply to Office Action dated 6/26/08

PATENT
PU030082
Customer No. 24498

Claim 6 recites that the string parameter corresponds to the new administration information. Applicant notes that the string parameter of Claim 5 corresponds to the new administration information which is an operative element of amended independent Claim 1. As recited in Claim 1, the new administration information configures the access point only if the third parameter and the second parameter match. Thus the use of the new administration information is very functional because it affects the configuration of the access point. Applicant respectfully submits that the string parameter which corresponds to the new administration information is clearly not “nonfunctional descriptive material” as suggested in the present Office Action.

Claims 5-6, 10-11, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “WRT51AB Dual-Band Wireless A+B Broadband Router User Guide” (WRT51AB), in view of “Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP), and in further view of “Request for Comments 1994: PPP Challenge Handshake Authentication Protocol (CHAP) and in further view of “Request for Comments 1321: The MD5 Message-Digest Algorithm” (MD5). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The teachings of WRT51AB, EAP, and CHAPS with respect to the pending amended independent claims are provided above. Claims 5-6 are dependent on independent Claim 1, Claims 10-11 are dependent on independent Claim 8, and Claims 16-17 are dependent on independent Claim 12.

MD5 describes the MD5 message digest algorithm. However, like WRT51AB, EAP, and CHAPS, MD5 also fails to teach or suggest the element of “configuring the access point with the new administration information in response to the comparing step only if the third parameter and the second parameter match” as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 5, and 12 upon which Claims 5-6, 10-11, and 16-17 depend.

Accordingly, Claims 5-6, 10-11, and 16-17 are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by the combination of WRT51AB, EAP, CHAPS, and MD5 per MPEP §2143.03.

Serial No. 10/549,466
Response dated 10/21/2008
Reply to Office Action dated 6/26/08

PATENT
PU030082
Customer No. 24498

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections on Claims 1-22 in light of the amendments and the arguments presented above.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,
Junbiao Zhang
Saurabh Mathur
Sachin Satish Mody

Date: October 21, 2008

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,800
(609) 734-6451

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312